

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 2-12 and 18-27 are pending in the present application, with claims 3 and 18 being independent. Claims 1 and 13-17 (which have been withdrawn from consideration) have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein. Claims 19-27 have been added, which do not add any new subject matter.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication on page 10 of the Office Action that claims 3 and 18 would be allowable.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter set forth therein.

Specifically, it appears that the Examiner only rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the Examiner did not identify any one of claims 2-12 in the rejection.

Therefore, because claim 1 has been cancelled, the rejection is now rendered moot.

**35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections**

Claims 1, 2, and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as allegedly being unpatentable over either Okushko, V.A., et al. 'Recording of double exposure holographic interferograms on photothermoplastic materials using residual memory,' Avtometriya Vol. 4 pp. 86-90 (1994) or Panasyuk, et al., 'Process of double-exposure interferogram formation on deformed surface of thermoplastic media. SPIE vol. 2851, pp. 150-157 (08/1996), in view of Augostini '885, Bean et al. '938 and Schwertz '698 combined with Levine '008 and Bartfai '643.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Okushko, V.A., et al or Panasyuk, et al. in view Augostini '885, Bean et al. '938 and Schwertz '698 combined with Levine '008 and Bartfai '643 and SU 1805445. .

As stated above, claim 1 has been cancelled and therefore the rejections against claim 1 are now rendered moot.

Furthermore, because claims 3 and 18 are now independent, which the Examiner states would be allowable, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate that claims 3 and

18 are allowed.

Dependent claims 2, and 4-12 should be considered allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim.

New claims 19-27 should also be considered allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim. Furthermore, and as stated above, claims 19-27 do not add any new subject matter. Therefore, favorable entry and allowance of claims 19-27 are respectfully requested.

#### ***Conclusion***

In view of the above amendments and remarks, this application appears to be in condition for allowance and the Examiner is, therefore, requested to reexamine the application and pass the claims to issue.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Martin Geissler (Reg. No. 51,011) at the telephone number below, which is located in the Washington, DC area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees

Appl. No. 09/596,556

required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Michael K. Mutter, #29,680

MKM/MRG:tm  
4494-0104P

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000